

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS WITHOUT MARKINGS

IN THE DRAWING:

Figs. 1, 2 have been amended.

REMARKS

The last Office Action of January 26, 2009 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-22 are pending in the application. Claims 8, 17, 19-20 have been amended. Claims 9-12 have been canceled. No claim has been added. An amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWING

Applicant submits herewith new Figs. 1 and 2 to replace "x_{soll}" with --x_{set}--. New drawing sheets are submitted and labeled "Replacement Sheet", respectively.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawing is thus respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the specification, as suggested by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner's rejection is confusing because claim 1 was not before the Examiner. Accordingly, this portion of the Office Action is not understood and clarification is requested to enable applicant to properly respond to this ground for rejection.

As claim 1 was cancelled in favor of claim 8, this rejection is presumed to relate to claim 8. Claim 8 recites 1) a set value generated in 2) response to deflection of a control element that cooperates with 3) means for producing pulse-shaped mechanical feedback when the set value changes.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-14, 16-17, 19-20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,560,983 to Williams. The Examiner's rejection is confusing because claims 1-7 were not before the Examiner. Accordingly, this portion of the Office Action is not understood and clarification is requested to enable applicant to properly respond to this ground for rejection. Since claims 1-7 were cancelled and replaced by claims 8 et seq., it appears that the rejection of "claims 1-14" [sic] was intended to be applied to claims 8-14. The claims have been amended to provide explicit cooperation among their elements, for the sake of clarity, not in response to this rejection.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to independent claims 8 and 20 and the following remarks.

Applicant's claim 8 recited a mechanical feedback provided to an operator, specifically "pulse-shaped" mechanical feedback. Furthermore, this feedback was recited as being provided for a change in a set value so that the operator can respond to that change in the set value and change the deflection of the control element from the rest position. The operator is better able to concentrate on watching the machining process without also needing to watch for a change in the set value, since mechanical, not visual feedback, is provided to the operator for this purpose by the controller. [0009].

In contrast, Williams discloses only a shaft encoder. Thus, the pulse-shaped signal cited by this Office Action, Fig. 5, is provided by the control

element 10 to the controller 18, not to the operator as is recited in applicant's claims, col. 6, lines 50-54 and col. 7, lines 14-21.

Furthermore, no feedback is provided to the operator for a change in a set value by Williams. On the contrary, Williams's feedback restricts or limits the rate or range of the control element's encoded angular rotation relative to Williams's preset value for angular rotation of the control element, not relative to a change in that set value, col. 8, lines 44-56 and Fig. 6.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Williams neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 8 and 20.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claims 8 and 20, respectively, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15, 18, 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Williams in view of published U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 2001/0000663 to Shahoian et al.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above and the following remarks.

Claims 15, 18, which depend from claim 8 and therefore contain all the limitations thereof, and claim 21, which depends from claim 20 and therefore contains all the limitations thereof, patentably distinguish over the applied prior art in the same manner as claims 8 and 20, respectively.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the claims on file. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: April 27, 2009
708 Third Avenue
Suite 1501
New York, N.Y. 10017
(212)244-5500
HMF/RL:af